



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/917,480	08/26/1997	SEAN R. WAKAYAMA	R-8767	4794

7590 03/31/2003

WESTERLUND & POWELL, P.C.
100 DAINGERFIELD RD.
SUITE 100
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2866

EXAMINER

DINH, TIEN QUANG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3644

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 36

Application Number: 08/917,480

Filing Date: August 26, 1997

Appellant(s): WAKAYAMA, SEAN R.

Raymond H.J. Powell
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

MAILED

MAR 31 2003

GROUP 3600

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 12/19/02.

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-20 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) *ClaimsAppealed*

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) *Prior Art of Record*

2,549,045	Ashkenas	4/1951
5,088,661	Whitener	2/1992
4,796,192	Lewis	1/1989

(10) *Grounds of Rejection*

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). This rejection is set forth in prior Office Action, Paper No. 32.

Claims 6, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). This rejection is set forth in prior Office Action, Paper No. 32.

(11) Response to Argument

In response to the applicant's arguments on the term "the", please note that "the bending moment" was not provided with proper antecedent basis. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph was made. The rejection still stands since "the bending moment" still lacks antecedent basis. The definition provided (Merriam-Webster's College Dictionary) by the applicant is appreciated but it has not overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph rejection.

As for the arguments by the Applicant that "the Examiner is not suggesting a combination of these references", the applicant misunderstood what the Examiner was saying. The Examiner used the teaching of Whitener and Lewis to teach that the control surfaces on wings are positioned at predetermined positions for certain flights configurations and are used to reduce bending moments are well known in the art. Although, Ashkenas is silent on the control surface configuration system in which the control surfaces are selectively reconfigurable to a plurality of predetermined positions as required to optimize the spanwise force distribution across the wing for each of a plurality of different flight configurations/conditions including a low speed flight condition in which a first selected one of the control surfaces are positioned to increase a local coefficient of lift and the other control surfaces are positioned to control pitch trim, Whitener clearly teaches that control surfaces on wings (such as those of Ashkenas) can

achieve these results. Furthermore, Lewis was used to show that Ashkenas control surfaces can be used to reduce bending moments. The Examiner does not suggest moving the parts of Whitener or Lewis on the Ashkenas' flight system.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the Whitner and Lewis references are used to show Ashkenas' flight system is capable of reducing of bending moments and is selectively reconfigurable to a plurality of predetermined positions as required to optimize the spanwise force distribution across the wing for each of a plurality of different flight configurations/conditions including a low speed flight condition in which a first selected one of the control surfaces are positioned to increase a local coefficient of lift and the other control surfaces are positioned to control pitch trim.

The Examiner maintains the inherency arguments since the spanwise force distribution across the wing is optimized for the maneuverability of the aircraft. The secondary references do teach "predetermined position, which in combination, optimize the spanwise force distribution across the wing for each of the plurality of different flight conditions." Please see the arguments above and in the previous office action.

Art Unit: 3644

Finally, the Examiner would like to point out that the Examiner has used the decision by the board of appeal as a road map in treating the respected case. In the decision by the board (paper 15), the board suggested that the Examiner may wish to consider computer-based flight management systems, aircraft operating manuals, and pilot operating handbooks. The Examiner has done so by introducing the Whitener and Lewis to show that the claimed subject matters are well known in the art and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have "combined" the references. For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



TD
March 21, 2003

Conferees
CJ, JWD

WESTERLUND & POWELL, P.C.
100 DANGERFIELD RD.
SUITE 100
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2866